

DEMAND V—STAMPS.

MR. K. N. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*): Sir, I rise to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 95,140 under Demand V—Stamps.

Motion 115.

The following motion was not moved:—

MR. N. K. KRISHNA PILLAI:

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 10,971 for establishment by Rs. 1.

PRESIDENT: I take it that the House grants Rs. 95,140 under Demand V—Stamps.

The grant was made.

DEMAND VI—REGISTRATION.

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): Sir, I rise to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 3,34,513 under Demand VI—Registration.

Motion 116.

MR. G. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): Sir, I beg to make the following motion:

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,400 for travelling allowance by Rs. 400.

My object is just to bring to the notice of the House the reckless way in which the State Exchequer is being drained by this officer under this item. The budget estimate for 1103 had a provision for Rs. 2,000 under this item. Under the revised estimate it rose up to Rs. 2,200; and for 1104 there is a provision of Rs. 2,400. I just want to know whether this increase was warranted by absolute necessity. There might be several Sub-Registry offices in a single taluk and if the Director would kindly take it into his head to inspect *all* the offices during one of his tours to that taluk, much of this amount can be reduced. I want to point out an instance that occurred in my taluk. The Director this year inspected the Sub-Registry office at Kayancolam and then went straight up to Chavarai, inspected that office and went away. After some time he again came to that taluk and inspected the offices at Krishnapuram and Karunagapalli. Now, it could be seen that he has drawn travelling allowance twice for the inspection of the offices in this one taluk, Karunagapalli. The offices at Krishnapuram and Karunagapalli lie just on the roadside from Kayancolam to Chavarai. He could have conveniently inspected these offices also at the time of his first tour when he inspected the offices at Kayancolam and Chavarai.

MR. N. K. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara*): Does the member think that these things are done by the Registration Director alone?

MR. G. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): I know it is the practice of all these Heads of Departments.

I therefore submit that this increase of Rs. 400 under this item should not be allowed until it is found absolutely necessary when a supplementary grant may be made. I submit, this amount should be reduced in the light of the fact that this officer has been misusing the grant under this item.

MR. L. R. RAJA RAJA VARMA KOIL TAMPURAN (*Changanachery cum Peermade*): ഞാൻ ആ ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെ പിൻതാങ്ങുന്നു.

PRESIDENT: I beg your pardon. Were you addressing the Chair?

MR. L. R. RAJA RAJA VARMA KOIL TAMPURAN (*Changanachery cum Peermade*): ഞാൻ ആ ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെ പിൻതാങ്ങുന്നു.

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): The actual amount of T. A. for the year 1101 was Rs. 2,000, for 1102 Rs. 2,170.....(*Louder, please.*)

MR. G. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): Was not that increase after the present Director took charge of the department?

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): The present Director took charge of the department in Kumbham 1102. The reason for the increase under this head in 1102 was that five more temporary Sub-Registry offices were opened in that year. And in 1103 eight more offices of the kind had been opened. There are therefore now thirteen offices more to be inspected by the Director of Registration than there were prior to 1102 when the allotment under this head was Rs. 2,000. Under these circumstances I am certain that the amount asked for would not be considered to be too high especially in view of the fact that as a result of the observations made in this House during the Budget Session of 1923 the Government had directed the Director of Registration to make more frequent inspections, as also surprise inspections, of these Sub-Registry offices.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara cum Kartikapalli*): Has the Director been able to report any case of corruption as a result of his tours?

PRESIDENT: I may answer the member. Immediately after his tour he has reported to me at least three instances in which the officers had been punished.

MR. G. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): Did he pay any surprise visits to the offices in the Karunagapalli taluk this year or last year?

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): I cannot say that. He has paid surprise visits to as many as six Sub-Registry offices; and in regard to some of them he found out certain irregularities for which Government took immediate and stringent action.

MR. G. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): May I know why the Director of Registration visited Karunagapalli twice this year?

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): I am not in a position to say that. The larger number of surprise inspections he undertook in the past and has to undertake in the future, I beg to submit, makes it clear that the amount asked for is not too high. I therefore think the member will himself consider that the necessity for the amount has been made out and withdraw his motion.

MR. G. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): If the Government would ask the Director not to misuse this item by going twice to the same place.....

PRESIDENT: I am afraid that is directly counter to the ruling that I gave. It is not a question of policy, but accusations that you are making.

MR. G. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): I submit, I find no reason why the Director went on tour to Karunagapalli twice this year. It has not been pointed out by the Government member that he paid surprise visits warranted by absolute necessity. All the inspections in that taluk could have been made during the first tour itself.

MR. K. N. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*): May I point out that the Director arranges his programme not with reference to any one station but to many; and therefore unless all the facts with reference to all these places are placed before the House it would not be possible for the House to come to a conclusion fair to the officer who himself is absent from this House?

MR. G. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): This much I can say. The two Sub-Registry offices lie on the road from Kayancolam to Chavarai. Therefore they could have been inspected by him during his first tour itself.

PRESIDENT: That is not a question of policy at all.

MR. R. KESAVA PILLAI (*Kottarakara cum Kunnattur*): What was the interval between these two tours?

MR. G. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): About a month.

PRESIDENT: I must rule the member out entirely. He is simply attacking a particular officer and not discussing a question of policy.

MR. G. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): I submit.....

PRESIDENT: You are bound by the ruling of the Chair. I have ruled you out of order.

MR. G. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): I withdraw the motion.

The motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

Motion 117.

The following motion was not made:

Mr. R. KESAVA PILLAI:

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,400 for travelling allowance by Rs. 100.

Motion 118.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): Sir, I beg to make the following motion:

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 20,400 for Direction by Rs. 100.

The object of the motion is to place before the House some circumstances with reference to some of the irregularities in the Registration Department. In moving this particular motion I am handicapped in more than one way in presenting before this House all the facts and figures by which I could convince the House of the irregularities in the matter of appointments, promotions and transfers in this Department. I shall first refer to certain interpellations which I asked and which still remain unanswered. My interpellations Nos. 14, 15, 16, 95 and 96 cover these points. Of these 14, 15 and 16 refer to appointments, promotions and transfers in the Registration Department. I asked these interpellations even in the previous Council and I have repeated them now. Still they have not been answered. What I want to point out for the attention of the Government is that when the members ask interpellations during the Budget Session for particular information they do so with a view to use the information during the discussion of the budget. So, if such interpellations are not chosen and answered in an intelligent way the members on this side of the House are sure to be handicapped.

There is another humiliation which I wish to present before this House. That is, when the members level certain charges against the head of a particular department they are asked to substantiate those charges. For this purpose we seek information at the hands of Government by means of interpellations. And they are not answered. Without substantiating the charges it is very difficult to make the House accept the proposition. Anyhow, I may inform, from very reliable information that I have, that after the devolution of powers in this department the Director has appointed and transferred certain men, a right which he does not have, strictly speaking.

Then again, with reference to the answer supplied by the Government yesterday, the Registration Test Examination is insisted upon as an additional qualification for promotion in the department. I know, Sir, some instances in which this rule was also violated and unqualified men were appointed superseding the claims of others who were equally qualified and who had better claims. Transfers are effected not to suit the exigencies of the service but for some other reason. These I put forward to convince the House. At present I am not able to show facts and figures.

When we make general charges like this before this House, as I have stated already, we are asked to substantiate legally these charges. That is the main way in which we are handicapped. With regard to such charges against the heads of departments I can only say this. When a man suffers from tooth-ache he only goes to the doctor and says that he is suffering from tooth-ache. He stops there and does not proceed to analyse the etiology of the disease. It is the business of the

[Mr. K. P. Nilakanta Pillai.]

doctor to find out the causes and apply the proper remedy. In the same way it is for the Government to find out the truth in regard to such allegations and take action. It is for them to scrutinise.

Again with reference to the appointments to the post of Head clerk, Head Accountant and Record-keeper, there were qualified hands in the office itself. But some others have been promoted to these places. Of course, it may be called temporary arrangement. But I am sure the arrangement may be made permanent. I do not understand why recommendations are first made to Government in a particular way and then when agitations are started those recommendations are cancelled and fresh recommendations made. I know instances of this kind. When non-official members get all the information that they want they will be in a position to give one or two instances of irregularity and then Government ought to take up the matter seriously in hand. Otherwise the evil will become a contagion and spread to other departments also. I do not mean any general disparagement when I say that some of the present Heads of Departments are not the persons to whom the people can look upon for the salvation of Travancore. Sir, I really admit that there are some officers in our State who are respectable both for their knowledge as well as for their integrity. I don't refer to such officers. But my point is when we quote certain instances about certain departments if the Government do not take serious action and curb the evil then and there as soon as specific instances are brought to their notice the evil will spread to other departments also; and they will also do the same thing having found out that serious action would not be taken. The non-official members of this House are not, Sir, very particular of wasting the time of this Council in discussing questions of appointments, promotions and transfers. But discontentment arises because of nepotism and favouritism. It is on account of these that clamour arises. We on this side of the House want perfect communal justice to be imparted to all communities of the State without showing any undue preferential treatment to any community over the claims of other communities. That is the attitude of this House. It is the irregularities on the part of some of these Heads of Departments that give rise to this hue and cry. All sorts of trouble and discontent arise out of this.

Another point which I want to draw the attention of the House to is the general charge of corruption prevailing in the department. From the answers given just now, Sir, it is seen that as a result of some surprise visits certain officers were reported upon and that Government have taken very stringent measures. So far as it goes it looks very satisfactory. Still, among the subordinates of the department corruption continues to prevail; and I am sure if the Director is very earnest in the matter he can put down the corruption.

With these words I make the motion for the kind consideration of the House.

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): Sir, the only point that I have to speak upon with reference to the member's allegations on this subject is this. He recommends that Government should do their level best to root out corruption in the subordinate ranks of the Registration Department also. I may assure the member that Government are very anxious to do it; and the lump sum provision of Rs. 25,000, that has been made in the budget for the year to improve the very poor salary of the subordinates of this department, will show that Government are anxious to place these subordinates above temptation. Side by side with the stringent and almost very hard action that the Government are taking against corrupt people, there is also this inducement to the poor low-paid subordinate staff which is sure to place them above temptation and improve the tone of the department.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): Sir, when the learned member in charge spoke he only referred to my last point. My grievance was with reference to the favouritism and nepotism prevalent in the department so far as appointments and transfers are concerned. If the Government is in a position to assure me that hereafter such things will be completely scrutinised, I have no intention to press the motion.

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): With regard to that, the Government need not give any answer as they are always particular in looking into the justice or otherwise of every appointment made by each and every head of the department when it is sent up to Government for sanction.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): Am I to understand that if any irregularity has been actually done it is with the approval of Government?

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): I do not admit that irregularities have been made.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): A time will come to me to prove that.

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): Then I shall answer.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara cum Kartikapalli*): May I know whether Government take care over these appointments?

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): They are generally very careful often over these matters.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): I beg to withdraw my motion.

The motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

Motion 119.

MR. N. R. KRISHNAN (*Nominated*): Sir, I beg to move the following motion:—

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 13,435 for District Registrars by Re. 1.—

[Mr. N. R. Krishnan.]

ഡിസ്ട്രിക്ട് രജിസ്ട്രാർമാർക്കു അനുവദിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള മന്ദ, രണ്ടു രൂപയിൽനിന്നും ഒരു രൂപാകരയ്ക്കുണമെന്നുള്ളതാണ് എന്റെ ഉപക്ഷേപം.

ഈ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിൽ പ്രാതിനിധ്യം കുറഞ്ഞ സമുദായങ്ങൾക്കു വേണ്ടവിധത്തിലുള്ള പ്രോത്സാഹനങ്ങൾ കിട്ടുന്നില്ല എന്നുള്ള വസ്തുതയെപ്പറ്റി പ്രസ്ഥാവിക്കാനാണ് ഞാൻ ഈ സഭമുൻപാകെ ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപം കൊണ്ടുവന്നിട്ടുള്ളത്. ഈ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിൽ എല്ലാ താണതരം ഉദ്യോഗങ്ങളിലും, ചെറിയ സമുദായക്കാർക്കു, അതായതു പ്രാതിനിധ്യം കുറഞ്ഞ സമുദായക്കാർക്കു സാരമായ ഉദ്യോഗങ്ങൾ ഒന്നുംതന്നെ കിട്ടുന്നില്ലെന്നുമാത്രമല്ല, അവർക്കു ഈ വിഷയത്തിൽ യാതൊരു പ്രോത്സാഹനവും ചെയ്യുന്നില്ലെന്നതന്നെ പറയേണ്ടിയിരിക്കുന്നു. ഈ സങ്കടത്തെപ്പറ്റിതന്നെ കഴിഞ്ഞ പ്രജാസഭാകാലത്തിൽ മെമ്പർമാർ പ്രസിഡൻറിന്റെ മുൻപാകെ ഒരു ഡെപ്യൂട്ടേഷൻ മുഖാന്തിരം കൊണ്ടുവരികയും അതിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു വേണ്ടതു പ്രവർത്തിയ്ക്കുന്നതിനു ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റു മേലധികാരികളോടു ചട്ടംകെട്ടാമെന്നു പറഞ്ഞിരുന്നുവെങ്കിലും ഇതുവരേ യാതൊന്നും ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ളതായി ഞങ്ങൾക്കറിവില്ല. ഇതിലേക്കുള്ള അപേക്ഷകന്മാരുടെ കൂട്ടത്തിൽ ഞങ്ങളുടെ സമുദായത്തിൽനിന്നും ഇദം പ്രഥമമായി പാസായിട്ടുള്ള ഒരു സ്ത്രീ ഗ്രാഡുവെററുകൂടി ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നു എന്ന വസ്തുത ഗവണ്മെന്റിനെ അറിയിക്കുകയും അതിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ച് പ്രത്യേകം പരിഗണിയ്ക്കുമെന്നു ഞങ്ങൾക്കു സമാധാനം കിട്ടുകയും ചെയ്തിരുന്നു. എന്നാൽ ഇതേവരെയായിട്ടും ഈ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിൽ ഇതിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ച യാതൊന്നുംതന്നെ ചെയ്തിട്ടില്ലെന്നറിയുന്നു. മേലാലേങ്കിലും പ്രാതിനിധ്യം കുറഞ്ഞ സമുദായക്കാർക്കു അവരുടെ യോഗ്യതയനുസരിച്ചുള്ള ഉദ്യോഗങ്ങൾകൊടുത്തു അവരെ വേണ്ടവിധത്തിൽ പ്രോത്സാഹിപ്പിയ്ക്കണമെന്നുള്ള അപേക്ഷയോടുകൂടി ഞാൻ ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെ സഭമുൻപാകെ അവതരിപ്പിച്ചുകൊള്ളുന്നു.

MR. P. S. MAHOMED (Nominated): മിസ്റ്റർ ക്ലർക്ക് അവതരിപ്പിച്ച ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെ പിൻതാങ്ങുന്നതിനു എന്നെക്കു കൂടുതൽ സന്തോഷമുണ്ട്. മിസ്റ്റർ ക്ലർക്ക് പ്രസ്ഥാവിച്ചപ്രകാരം പിന്നണിയിൽ നിൽക്കുന്ന സമുദായങ്ങൾക്കു ഈ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റുകളിൽ നിന്നും വേണ്ടവിധത്തിൽ ഉള്ള പ്രോത്സാഹനങ്ങൾ ലഭിയ്ക്കുന്നില്ലെന്നു പറയാതെ നിവൃത്തിയില്ല. ഇതിനുകാരണം ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റു മേധാവികളുടെ ന്യൂനതയാണോ എന്നു എനിയ്ക്കറിയാൻ പാടില്ല. ഞങ്ങളുടെ ഭാഗ്യദോഷമായിരിക്കണം അവർ അതിൽ ശ്രദ്ധ പതിപ്പിക്കാത്തതു്. ഏകദേശം പത്തു

പതിനഞ്ചുകൊല്ലത്തിനു മുൻപു ഒരു മഹമ്മദീയനെ സബ്ജിസ്ട്രാറായി നിയമിച്ചു. അന്നുമുതൽ ഇന്നുവരെയും ആ ഒരു മഹമ്മദനല്ലാതെ വേറെ ആരെയും നിയമിച്ചിട്ടില്ല. അതിനുശേഷം ഈ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിൽനിന്നും ഞങ്ങൾക്കു ഒന്നുതന്നെ ചെയ്തുകൊണ്ടിട്ടില്ല എന്നസംഗതി പറയാതിരിക്കുവാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ല. ചെറിയ ഉദ്യോഗങ്ങളിൽ പ്രവേശിക്കുകയാണെങ്കിലും ഞങ്ങൾക്ക് ഒരുപ്രമോഷനും കിട്ടുന്നില്ല. ഗവണ്മെന്റത്തരവിനെ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റധികൃതന്മാർ തുണതുല്യമായി വിചാരിക്കുക മാത്രമെ ചെയ്യുന്നുള്ളൂ. അതിനാൽ ഞര വിഷയത്തിൽ ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ ശ്രദ്ധ ബലമായി പതിയേണ്ടതാണ്. ഇങ്ങിനെ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിലെ ഓരോ മേധാവികളും ശ്രദ്ധിക്കാതിരിക്കുന്നപക്ഷം അത് ഗവണ്മെന്റിനനുതരുന്ന ഒരു വലിയ പോരായ്മയാണെന്ന് വിചാരിക്കണമെന്നുള്ള അപേക്ഷയോടുകൂടി ഞാൻ മിസ്റ്റർ ക്ലർക്കിന്റെ ഉപദേശപത്തെ ചിന്താക്കുന്നു.

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): Sir, in regard to the encouragement of duly qualified members from depressed classes or unrepresented communities the Government, as well as the Director, are anxious that their claims should be looked into, as far as possible, without detriment to efficiency. No instance has been shown that any claim of qualified members from those communities have been over-looked.

MR. N. R. KRISHNAN (*Nominated*): ൧൦൨-ലും ൧൦൩-ലുംഎത്ര സബ്ജിസ്ട്രാർമാരെ പുത്തനായിട്ടു നിയമിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്?

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): In 1103?

MR. N. R. KRISHNAN (*Nominated*): ൧൧൦൨-ലും ൧൧൦൩-ലും?

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): Five were appointed in 1102 and 8 more in 1103.

MR. N. R. KRISHNAN (*Nominated*): ഇതിൽ എത്രരോട്ടവരും എത്ര മഹമ്മദീയരും എത്ര കൃഷ്ണാനികളും ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നു?

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): In 1103, one of them was an Ezhava.

MR. N. R. KRISHNAN (*Nominated*): ൧൧൦൨ൽ എത്ര?

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): I do not know.

MR. N. R. KRISHNAN (*Nominated*): ൧൦൨-ൽ എത്ര അപേക്ഷകന്മാരുണ്ടായിരുന്നു? ൧൦൩-നെക്കാൾ കുറവോ കൂടുതലോ?

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): I not know that exactly.

MR. P. S. MAHOMED (*Nominated*): മഹമ്മദിയർ എത്രയുണ്ടായിരുന്നു?

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): The general policy is to give them preference.

MR. N. R. KRISHNAN (*Nominated*): രണ്ടുവ സ്ത്രീകളിൽ ബി. എ. പാസ്സായവർ ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നോ?

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): The question of allowing entrance to ladies is being considered.

MR. N. R. KRISHNAN (*Nominated*). ഇതിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു വേണ്ട വിധത്തിൽ ആലോചിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു എന്നു പറയുന്നതുകൊണ്ട് ഞാൻ രണ്ടു ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെ പിൻവലിച്ചുകൊള്ളുന്നു.

The motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

Motion 120.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum*): Sir, I beg to move the following motion,

To omit the allotment of Rs. 25,000 the lump provision for the revision of pay of the clerical staff.

Sir, when the Council is called upon to vote on grants it has a right to know what the funds are required for. Here, no doubt, it is stated that it is for the revision of the pay of the clerical staff. That is not what this House is entitled to know, but how the revision is going to be effected and whose pay is to be raised. All these the House has a right to know and unless the necessary details are placed before the House such a grant should not be voted upon. The revision of the pay of the clerical staff of the Registration Department could not have been an unforeseen emergency and the details could have been worked out before the estimates were prepared. Further, there is absolutely no data on which the House can come to any conclusion as to whether this large amount is needed at all. In the next year's estimate a prominent feature is the lump provisions made in it and these provisions amount to Rs. one and a half lakhs. Of course, each provision may have to be considered on its own merits. But so far as this particular provision is concerned, I do not see any necessity, to grant it before the details as to the application of the money, is presented to the House. With these words I make this motion.

MR. K. N. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*): Sir, with your permission I should like to clear the grounds with regard to the provision made in the budget for lump sum grants and in particular to the provision now before the House. I submitted at the time of my concluding speech that we resorted to lump sum grants only in cases of absolute necessity and that it was not to increase the salaries of higher staff but to relieve the distress of those who are at the bottom of the ladder. Three cases of lump sum grants have been provided in the budget. One is under Registration Department to improve the pay of men most of whom who draw a salary rising from Rs. 15-1½/3-24. In another case it is to pull up the pay of peons and petty officers in the

Excise Department who have to retire on Rs. 10 or Rs. 11. The third one is for the Anchal Department, mainly for the revision of pay of those men who are drawing Rs. 15 or 20 and who have got a lot of responsibility.

Now as to the principle of making provision for lump sum grants.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): Under the Police Department also there is a lump sum provision.

MR. K. N. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*): I thank the member for reminding me of it.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara cum Kartikapalli*): Is the member speaking on the policy of allotting lump sums?

PRESIDENT: As Finance member he is entitled to explain any principle of financial policy.

MR. K. N. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*): As to the provision of lump sum grants I beg to assure the House that it is not the intention of Government to fritter away the amounts. The objects which are indicated in the budget are to distribute the lump sums which will not be much but will be very very small, when distributed away to a number of low paid staff. When this is done, an examination could be made not merely in the Secretariat chambers but also in the Finance Committee, the proceedings of which will ultimately be available to the members of this House.

As I said before, the Government really want to take the Finance Committee into their confidence in this matter. Having said about the lump sum grants generally, Sir, I wish to proceed to this particular case. I shall repeat what I have stated with regard to the Registration clerks. There are 352 men drawing Rs. 15/1½/3-24, and these men, as the members of the House are aware, have to go to their office at seven or half-past seven in the mornings and they can get back to their house late in the evening and they have to go without food in the day as they cannot go home and are too poor to go to a hotel. The proposal now is that the bulk of these men, that is about three-fourths of them, should be given a salary of Rs. 20-1½-25. The ordinary scale of clerks in the last grade in the clerical service is Rs. 20-2/3-30. But in this case owing to the large number of men involved and owing to the various other considerations that were in the minds of the Finance Department at the time, the proposal was to Rs. 20-1½-25 and that was for 277 only out of 352. The other 75 men who are practically Clerks are to be given Rs. 25 rising up to Rs. 30. I hope on its merits the House will not be led away that it is a high provision so as to direct its jealous attention. When the whole thing was worked out the total came to Rs. 29,000; and we wanted to limit it to Rs. 25,000. I hope with these explanatory remarks it will be possible for the mover to withdraw the motion.

MR. R. RAMAN PILLAI (*Kottayam*): െരം ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെ ഞാൻ ബലമായി പിൻതാങ്ങുന്നു, രജിസ്ട്രേഷൻ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിൽ ഇമസ്കാ

[Mr. R. Raman Pillai.]

ക്കളുടെ എണ്ണം പറഞ്ഞതു ശരിതന്നെയാണു്. പതിനഞ്ചുരൂപാ ശമ്പളമുള്ളവരായിട്ടു പതിനെട്ടു ദെമ്പററി ഗുമസ്താക്കൾ മാത്രമേയുള്ളൂ. സ്ഥിരമായ ഗുമസ്താക്കൾക്കെല്ലാം പതിനഞ്ചു മുതൽ ഇരുപതുരൂപാവരെയാണു ശമ്പളം കൊടുക്കുന്നതു്. ഇപ്പോൾ പതിനാറുരൂപായിൽ കുറയാതെ ശമ്പളം ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കണം. നൂറു-ൽ ആയിരിക്കണം രണ്ടു പരിഷ്കാരം നടന്നതു്.

MR. K. N. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*): May I interfere and say that when new men are appointed they start on Rs. 15?

MR. R. RAMAN PILLAI (*Kottayam*): പുതിയ നിയമനത്തിൽപെട്ടവർ അങ്ങിനെയും വന്നേയ്ക്കാം. രണ്ടു ഗുമസ്തന്മാർ ഒന്നു മണിക്കു പോയി സമ്പ്രദായം വേലചെയ്യേണ്ടവരായി വരുന്നു. എന്നാൽ എട്ടുമണി മുതൽ നടന്നു പള്ളിക്കൂടത്തിൽപോയി വേലചെയ്യുന്ന അധ്യാപകന്മാർക്കു യാതൊരു കാര്യംകൂടാതെ തിരിച്ചുവരുന്നു. ഇങ്ങനെ വേലചെയ്യുന്ന രണ്ടു നൂറു പണക്കാരെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു ലവലേശം അനുഭാവം ശവണ്മന്റിനു കാണിയ്ക്കുന്നതിനു ഇതുവരെ സാധിച്ചിട്ടില്ലെന്നു പറയേണ്ടിയിരിക്കുന്നതിൽ മനസ്സാപിക്കുന്നു. രണ്ടു ഗുമസ്താക്കളെ സംബന്ധിച്ചെടുത്തോളം പറയുകയാണെങ്കിൽ ദിവസംപ്രതി രണ്ടുരൂപാ കീശയിലാക്കാതെ അവർ വീട്ടിൽ പോകയില്ല എന്നു സത്യംചെയ്തുപറയാം. രജിസ്ട്രാർമാരിൽ നൂററിനു നൂറു പേരും തീർച്ചയായിട്ടും പത്തുരൂപായിൽ കുറയാതെ കയ്യിലാക്കിയിട്ടല്ലാതെ വീട്ടിൽ പോകയില്ല. ബാക്കി രണ്ടു ശതമാനംമാത്രം മൂർച്ചക്കാരായിരിക്കണം.

MR. K. N. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*): Does the member suggest that that should be the legitimate form of remuneration to be upheld by this House and taken into account for fixing their pay?

MR. R. RAMAN PILLAI (*Kottayam*): അങ്ങിനെയല്ല. അതിനെക്കുറിച്ചു പറയുവാനുള്ളതു മുഴുവൻ പറഞ്ഞുകഴിഞ്ഞാൽ രണ്ടു ചോദ്യത്തിനു വകാശമില്ലാതെ വരും. ഇങ്ങനെ ഒരു കാര്യംപോലും കിട്ടാത്തേയിരിക്കുന്ന അധ്യാപകന്മാർക്കു ശമ്പളക്കൂടുതൽ കൊടുത്തല്ലാതെ യാതൊരു ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിലുള്ള ഗുമസ്തന്മാർക്കും ശമ്പളക്കൂടുതൽ കൊടുക്കേണ്ട ആവശ്യമില്ല എന്നാണു എനിക്ക് പറയാനുള്ളതു്. അധ്യാപകന്മാർക്കു ശമ്പളമല്ലാതെ മറ്റു ഒരുവിധത്തിലും വരുമാനത്തിനുമാർഗ്ഗമില്ല. കൂടാതെ അവർക്കു വേറെ ഒരുജോലിയും നോക്കാൻ പാടില്ല. വല്ല ട്യൂഷനും

കൂടി പാടില്ലാതിരിക്കുന്നു. ക്ലാസിൽ പഠിപ്പിക്കുന്നതിനായി രാത്രിമുഴുവനും മുഷിഞ്ഞിരുന്നു നോട്ടുകൾ തയ്യാറാക്കണം. അല്പാപകന്മാർക്ക് ശമ്പളക്കൂട്ടൽ കൊടുത്തതിനുശേഷം മാത്രമേ വേറെയുള്ള ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിൽ ശമ്പളംകൂട്ടാവൂ. ഞ്ഞ അഭിപ്രായത്തോടുകൂടി ഞാൻ ഞ്ഞ ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെ ബലമായി പിൻതാങ്ങുന്നു.

MR. K. N. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*): Sir, I rise on a point of personal explanation. The previous speaker observed that the lot of Vernacular School teachers should have been first considered by Government when the budget was framed before they put in any provision for revising the pay of anybody, particularly the clerks of the Registration Department. I have submitted already the considerations which were in the minds of Government to postpone the making of a definite provision for increasing the pay of the Vernacular School teachers in this budget. It was not that the Vernacular School teachers were not considered entitled to any increase that no provision was made. On the other hand, Government also hoped that something should be done this year but there were other considerations. It was not a question of making an adequate provision or no adequate provision but the question was whether in the case of Vernacular School teachers the increase of their pay might be compensated by another item of revenue.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): May I know from the member whether he has found increased provision for compensating the increased amounts budgeted for the reorganisation of several departments?

MR. K. N. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*): It is not quite relevant. In the case of Vernacular School teachers the Committee had made certain suggestions and the question is whether any definite item of revenue should be raised or whether some reduction should be effected within the Vernacular Department to compensate the increase of expenditure. That is a question for the House as well as for the Government to consider. I am only submitting, Sir, that the issue should not be clouded by the absence of a provision for Vernacular School teachers. In the light of the explanation that a specific provision for particular item.....

MR. MURUVELIL PACHU PILLAI (*Shertallai*): ക്ലാക്കന്മാരുടെ ശമ്പളം കൂട്ടണമെന്നു അവരുടെ വല്ലാപരാതിയും കിട്ടിയിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

MR. K. N. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*): There might have been many memorials. I may assure the member that it is based on various representations made to the department that the Head of the department makes a recommendation to Government. This is then sent to the Finance Department. It may be sent back to the departmental head for further remarks after scrutiny. Then there may be further criticisms and probably after a round table conference a proposal will be put.....

MR. MURUVELIL PACHU PILLAI (*Shertallai*) : ക്ലാക്കനാരുടെയോ അല്ലാപകനാരുടെയോ ആരുടെ പരാതിയാണു അധികം?

MR. K. N. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*) : I have already explained that the issue should not be clouded that as there is no provision for increasing the pay of Vernacular School teachers, this particular provision should not be allowed.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum*) : May I know when this proposal was made?

MR. K. N. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*) : I can answer only in regard to the general points and I cannot answer in regard to particular details.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara cum Kartikapalli*) : Was any recommendation made by this Council on the matter?

PRESIDENT : That does not lie within the power of the Council.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum*) : I am not at all satisfied with the explanation given by the Government member. The point raised was as to what stood in the way of details being worked out and presented to this House. Absolutely nothing has been said by the other side on that point. Mr. Ramasubba Aiyar was concerned more with the necessity of increasing the pay of these clerks. What I say is that there may be a necessity or may not be a necessity for increasing their pay. But my point was that there was no sufficient data before the House which would help it to come to a conclusion whether any grant was required and what was required and in which way the Government are going to utilise the amount.

MR. K. N. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*) : May I ask the member whether details have not been indicated as to the number of men who are to be given increase in pay?

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum*) : I think the number of men was 352, and some of them are getting Rs. 15 to 20.

MR. K. N. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*) : It is not correct, Sir. It is Rs. 15 to 24.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum*) : Yes, and the others?

MR. K. N. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*) : Rs. 20 to 30.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum*) : The increments proposed are Rs. 20 to 25 and Rs. 20 to 30.

MR. K. N. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*) : No, Sir. The proposed increased pay is Rs. 15 to 25 and to a small number of men Rs. 25 to 30.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum*) : I may take it, Sir, that on an average it is an increase of Rs. 5. Even then the total will not be more than Rs. 20,000 a year as it is only 370 clerks.

MR. K. N. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Financial Secretary to Government*): May I suggest, Sir, that as it is an arithmetical calculation the matter may be left to the Financial Department?

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): Are we bound to do it?

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum*): Then how are we to come to any conclusion in the matter. Even when amounts specifically provided for are not required it is the practice of this House to cut down the amount. Here, so far as I can understand, even the explanation given by Mr. Ramasubba Aiyar and the figures given by him could not justify the inclusion of Rs. 25,000 in the budget under this head and he is not in a position to tell me or the House whether the Government had at any time considered this aspect of the matter.

MR. P. S. MAHOMED (*Nominated*): ഈ ഏറ്റവും ചെറിയതും കൂടുതലായും കൊണ്ടുവരുന്നില്ലേ?

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum*): No doubt, the Finance Committee is composed of members of this House, but then, this House is not the Finance Committee and there is a distinction between the two. I take it that the entire budget has been scrutinised by the Finance Committee but it is now before this House. This House is not bound to accept it.

MR. G. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Karunagapalli*): Does the member think that the clerks are poorly paid?

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum*): They may be poorly paid but that is not my point. As the purpose for which it is provided is not clear, I press the motion.

The motion was put to vote and lost.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): I demand a poll.

A poll was taken with the following results:—

AYES—19.

- | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. V. Chellam Pillai | 11. Mr. Tariatu Kunjtomman |
| 2. „ A. S. Damodaran Asan | 12. „ K. P. Nilakanta Pillai |
| 3. „ A. G. Menon | 13. „ V. J. Oommen |
| 4. „ Ittoop Itteechan | 14. „ Muruvelil Pachu Pillai |
| 5. „ R. Kesava Pillai | 15. „ K. G. Paramesvaran Pillai |
| 6. „ T. C. Kesava Pillai | 16. „ L. R. Raja Raja Varma |
| 7. „ Tamarapallil Kochu | Koil Tampuran |
| Tomman | 17. „ R. Raman Pillai |
| 8. „ N. R. Krishnan | 18. „ Revatinal Rama Varma |
| 9. „ N. K. Krishna Pillai | Raja |
| 10. „ V. S. Krishna Pillai | 19. „ A. Thanu Pillai |

NOES—19.

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Mr. I. C. Chacko | 10. Mr. K. Madhavan |
| 2. „ J. J. Daniel | 11. „ T. K. Madhavan Nayar |
| 3. „ R. Dhanukoti Pillai | 12. „ Kayalam Paramesvaran Pillai |
| 4. „ D. Francis. | 13. „ S. Piraviperumal Pillai |
| 5. „ P. Gomatinayakam Pillai | 14. Dr. K. Raman Tampi |
| 6. „ D. G. Joseph. | 15. Mr. K. N. Ramasubba Aiyar |
| 7. Rao Bahadur K. A. Krishna Aiyangar | 16. „ T. P. Ramasubba Aiyar |
| 8. Mr. P. N. Krishna Pillai | 17. „ S. C. H. Robinson |
| 9. Dr. N. Kunjan Pillai | 18. „ R. Vaidyalingom Pillai |
| | 19. „ A. Vipin |

NEUTRALS—7.

- | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Mr. K. C. Karunakaran | 4. Mr. P. S. Mahomed |
| 2. „ A. C. Kuriakose | 5. „ Matthew Murikkan |
| 3. „ H. B. Mahomed Rowther | 6. „ G. P. Nilakanta Pillai |
| | 7. „ K. Padmanabha Panikkar |

PRESIDENT : The result of the poll is that 19 are *for* the motion 19 *against* and 7 *neutrals* and I give my casting vote against the motion.

The motion was declared lost.

Motion 121.

The following motion was not moved :—

MR. A. THANU PILLAI :

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,678 for Registrar of Joint Stock Companies by Rs. 10.

Motion 122.

MR. A. G. MENON (*Parur*) : I beg to move the following motion.

To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 3,34,513 under Demand VI by Re. 1.

I bring forward this motion, in order to draw the attention of the House to a rule under the Registration Regulation, which lays down that for the visit of a Sub-Registrar to a person's residence Rs. 10 should be paid and that, if any male member of the family were to register a document he will have to pay Rs. 2 in addition and a certificate is also necessary. Formerly only the sum of Rs. 5 was charged for these visits and all the members of the family were allowed to have the documents registered in the private residence itself. Now, not only an additional two rupees is to be paid for each male member but in some cases a formal certificate to the effect that he is not well should be produced. The income derived from this source is absolutely nominal while the inconvenience of the rule is very great. No particular inconvenience is likely to be experienced by the Registrar in effecting the registration of the document with regard to the male members also, while the public are inconvenienced to a great degree. Suppose in a family consisting of 50 or 60 members, there are only half a dozen ladies. As regards the male members each one will have to

present himself before the Sub-Registrar for registering documents. This is necessary not only in the case of partition deeds but alienation deeds even require registration. The amount of inconvenience to the public is very great. While the remuneration that is received, that is the income under that item, is absolutely small, I do not know whether it is worth while to earn a few rupees by causing so much inconvenience to the public at large. There was only Rs. 5 formerly for a residential visit. It was increased to Rs. 10. And with this Rs. 10 this additional income of Rs. 2 is also demanded. Every one will not be able to pay this additional sum. And in the case of those who will not be able to pay this sum they will have to attend the Sub-Registrars' Office for the registration of the document. Therefore what I suggest is that the rule should be so changed that by the payment of Rs. 10 every member of a family, male or female, be allowed to have any document registered in the family itself.

MR. R. RAMAN PILLAI (*Kottayam*): ഞാൻ ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെ പിൻതാങ്ങി രണ്ടുവാക്കു പറഞ്ഞു കൊള്ളട്ടെ. ജനറൽ അഡ്മിനിസ്ട്രേഷന്റെ ഗുണഭോഷത്തെ വിവരിയ്ക്കുന്ന ഒന്നാണിത് എന്ന് വിചാരിയ്ക്കുന്നു. ഒന്നാമതായിട്ടു എനിയ്ക്കു പറയുവാനുള്ളത് ഗവണ്മെൻറുദ്യോഗസ്ഥന്മാർ താഴ്ന്ന ജോലിക്കാക്കു ജോലി ചെയ്യുവാൻ നല്ല മനസ്സിലാത്തവിധത്തിൽ അവർക്കു നിരാശയെ ജനിപ്പിച്ച് പല വിഷയങ്ങളും ഉണ്ടാക്കിത്തീർക്കുന്നു എന്നാണ്. ഇപ്പോൾ പലപല പ്രധാനസ്ഥാനങ്ങളിൽ ആളുകൾ നിയമിയ്ക്കപ്പെടാതെ ഒഴിഞ്ഞു കിടക്കുന്നുണ്ട്. ആ സ്ഥാനങ്ങൾക്കവകാശപ്പെട്ട ആളുകൾക്കു അതു കിട്ടാതിരിയ്ക്കുന്ന വിധത്തിലാക്കി അവരുടെ നിരാശയെ വർദ്ധിപ്പിയ്ക്കുന്നു.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Is the member speaking of officers in the Registration Department?

MR. R. RAMAN PILLAI (*Kottayam*): Then I resume my seat Sir.

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): Sir, the rule was modified only recently in pursuance of a demand in that direction by this House. The old rule was that in the case of persons who were not entitled to the exemption—and their description is given in Section 52 passed under the Regulation—their admission could not be recorded at private residences, even though the Registrar goes to the House. When once the Registrar goes to the private residence, a fee of Rs. 2 is sufficient. The rule as it now stands is much more favourable as it allows the recording of their admissions on a small payment of Rs. 2 in respect of each such executant. However, if the member thinks that the point should be considered, there is no objection to place the matter before the Director of Registration for remarks.

MR. A. G. MENON (*Parur*): The member was referring to the rule which says that every one should pay Rs. 10. I am not referring to

[Mr. A. G. Menon.]

that rule. It was only recently that this was reduced to Rs. 2. It is a matter of recent addition. I think it must be within six or seven years at the most. That has been recently changed to Rs. 2 per man. The old rule was that on the payment of five rupees every member of the family can have it at the family house itself.

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): I have no objection to consider the question.

The motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

Motion 123.

MR. N. R. KRISHNAN (*Nominated*): രജിസ്ട്രേഷൻ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റിന്റേതല്ല നവദിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള ന്യൂനത, മെമ്പർ രൂപയിൽ നിന്നും ൧൦ രൂപാ കരയ്ക്കുണമെന്നുള്ളതാണ് എന്റെ ഉപക്ഷേപം.

ഇവിടെ പരസ്പരസഹായ സംഘങ്ങൾ രജിസ്റ്റർ ചെയ്തു കൊടുക്കുന്നതിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ച ഒരു ഭേദഗതി ചെയ്യണമെന്നുള്ളതിനാലാണ് ഈ സഭാ മുമ്പാകെ ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപം അവതരിപ്പിച്ചത്. അതായത്, ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ ഡിപ്പാർട്ടുമെന്റു നയം വഗ്ദായപരമായിട്ടുള്ള സംഘങ്ങൾ രജിസ്റ്ററാക്കാൻ പാടില്ല എന്നാണ്. അതു വാസ്തവത്തിൽ നല്ലതാണ്. അനുഭവത്തിൽ വരുന്നത് സന്തോഷവുമാണെന്നു സമ്മതിക്കുന്നതിരിയ്ക്കുവാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ല. എന്നാൽ ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ അനുഭവം എങ്ങിനെയിരിയ്ക്കുന്നുവെന്നു ഒന്നു നോക്കേണ്ടതായിട്ടുണ്ട്. ഈ പരസ്പരസഹായ സംഘങ്ങൾ കൊണ്ടു ഉദ്ദേശിയ്ക്കുന്നതു സാധുക്കളെ ധനവാന്മാരുടെ പിടിയിൽ നിന്നും വിടുത്തി അവരുടെ സ്വന്തനിലയിൽ നിൽക്കുന്നതിനു വേണ്ട സഹായം നല്കണം എന്നുള്ളതാണ് ഇതിന്റെ പരമോദ്ദേശം. അതിലേക്കു സാമുദായികമായ സംഘങ്ങൾ ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നാൽ മാത്രമേ സാധിക്കയുള്ളൂ. സാധാരണ പരിഷ്കൃതസഹായ സംഘങ്ങളിൽ ഓഹരിക്കാക്കു പണം അനുവദിച്ചു കൊടുക്കേണ്ടതു സംഘാംഗങ്ങളിൽ നിന്നും തിരിഞ്ഞെടുത്തിട്ടുള്ള ഒരു കമ്മററിയാണ്. എന്നാൽ പിന്നോക്കം നിൽക്കുന്ന സമുദായക്കാർ ഈ കമ്മററിയിൽ രംഗമായിട്ടു തീരാൻ വളരെ പ്രയാസമുണ്ട്. വാസ്തവത്തിൽ പിന്നോക്കം നിൽക്കുന്ന സമുദായക്കാർ സൊസൈറ്റിയിൽ ഓഹരിക്കാർ ആണെങ്കിലും സൊസൈറ്റി കൊണ്ടു ഉദ്ദേശിക്കുന്ന ഫലം തീരെ കിട്ടുന്നില്ല.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*). May I ask whether the member is speaking of Co-operative Societies or Joint Stock Companies? If he is referring to co-operative societies at present, he is not in order.

MR. N. R. KRISHNAN (*Nominated*): I am speaking of Joint Stock Companies?

ഞാൻ ജോയിൻറ് സ്റ്റോക്കു കമ്പനിയെ പററിയാണ് സംസാരിക്കുന്നത്.

മേല്പറഞ്ഞ കാരണങ്ങളാൽ പിന്നോക്കം നിൽക്കുന്ന സമുദായക്കാർക്കു സൊസൈറ്റി കൊണ്ടു യാതൊരു ഫലവുമില്ല. ഇപ്പോൾ സാമൂഹിക സംഘങ്ങൾ രജിസ്റ്റർ ചെയ്തു കൊടുക്കാത്തതു നിമിത്തം മറ്റുള്ള സമുദായങ്ങളിൽ നിന്നും ഒന്നോ രണ്ടോ പേരെ കൂടി ചേർത്തു സൊസൈറ്റി രജിസ്റ്റർ ചെയ്തതിനു ശേഷം ചേർത്ത അന്യസമുദായക്കാരെ പിരിച്ചു വിട്ടു സൊസൈറ്റിസാമൂഹികനിലയിൽ നടത്തി വരുകയാണ് ചെയ്യുന്നത്. ഇതു രജിസ്ട്രാരുടെ സാമൂഹികമായ സംഘങ്ങൾ പതിച്ചു കൊടുക്കുകയില്ലാ എന്നുള്ള ഉത്തരവിന്റെ കാര്യം കൊണ്ടാണ്. വർഗ്ഗീയ സംഘങ്ങൾ ഇല്ലാത്തതുകൊണ്ടു അധികം ബുദ്ധിമുട്ടു അനുഭവിക്കുന്നത് പിന്നോക്കംനിൽക്കുന്ന സമുദായക്കാരാണ്. അതു കൊണ്ടു വർഗ്ഗീയ സംഘങ്ങൾ രജിസ്റ്റർ ചെയ്തു കൊടുക്കണമെന്നാണ് എന്റെ അപേക്ഷ.

MR. S. PIRAVIPERUMAL PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*): Is the member talking of co-operative Joint stock companies?

MR. N. R. KRISHNAN (*Nominated*). Joint Stock companies, I said plainly.

വർഗ്ഗീയസംഘങ്ങൾ രജിസ്റ്റർ ചെയ്തു കൊടുക്കുന്നതിനു വേണ്ടത്ര രജിസ്ട്രാർ പതിപ്പിക്കണമെന്നു അപേക്ഷയോടുകൂടി ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപത്തെ സഭാ സമക്ഷം അവതരിപ്പിച്ചു കൊള്ളുന്നു.

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): I am not quite certain whether there is any prohibition of the kind referred to by the member in regard to joint stock companies. If there is the matter will be considered if the member will hand in a statement.

MR. N. R. KRISHNAN (*Nominated*): ഇതിനെപറ്റി വേണ്ടതു ശരിയായി ആലോചിക്കാമെന്നു പറയുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു എന്റെ ഉപക്ഷേപം പിൻവലിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു.

The motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

Motion 124.

The following motion was not moved :—

MR. S. PIRAVIPERUMAL PILLAI :

To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 3,34,513 under Demand VI by Rs. 10,

Motion 125.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum*): Sir, I beg to move the following motion.

To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 3,34,513 under Demand VI by Rs. 10.

I move this with a view to suggest the desirability of giving more particulars in the statistics published along with the departmental report. There is a good deal of talk about the economic condition of the agriculturist going down, and about their getting into debts. So, if provision is made for collecting necessary information under certain additional heads also, that will be of much help to the public while it will not very much inconvenience the department. The classification of documents executed by or in favour of agriculturists or persons following other occupations, should be given in the statistics. After the passing of the social legislations—the Nayar, Ezhava and Vellala Regulations—it will be useful to know how these communities fare in consequence of the partition in their tarwads. So, I would suggest that particulars as to the communities to which the parties to documents belong should also be given in the reports. With a view to suggest the desirability of this, I am making this motion.

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): The matter will be duly considered.

The motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

Motion 126.

The following motion was not made :

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI:

To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 3,34,513 under Demand VI by Rs. 100.

Motion 127.

MR. MURUVELIL PACHU PILLAI (*Shertallai*): രജിസ്ട്രേഷൻ ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റിലേയ്ക്കും ബഡ്ജറ്റിൽ കൊള്ളിച്ചിട്ടുള്ള ൩,൩൪,൫൧൩ രൂപയിൽനിന്നും ൧൦൦ രൂപാകുറയ്ക്കണമെന്നുള്ളതാണ് എന്റെ ഉപക്ഷേപം. ഈ ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റിന്റെ പൊതുവെയുള്ള നയത്തേയും, ഇപ്പോഴത്തെ ജോലിനടത്തിപ്പിനേയും സംബന്ധിച്ച ചില വിവരങ്ങൾക്കും സഭയുടെ ആലോചനയ്ക്കും വിഷയമാക്കുവാനാണ് ഞാൻ ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപംകൊണ്ടു വന്നിട്ടുള്ളത്. ഈ ഡിപ്പാർട്ട്മെന്റിൽ ഇപ്പോഴുള്ള ക്ലാർക്കുമാർക്ക് ശമ്പളം കൂട്ടുന്നതിന് ഒരു മൊത്തത്തുക ൨൫,൦൦൦ രൂപ കൊള്ളിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളതായിട്ടു കാണുന്നുണ്ട്. എന്നാൽ ഇപ്പോഴുള്ള ക്ലാർക്കുമാർക്ക് ജോലി കൂടുതൽ കൊണ്ടാണ് ശമ്പളം കൂട്ടണമെന്നു വിചാരിയ്ക്കുന്നതെങ്കിൽ ആ ജോലികൂടുതലിനെ കുറയ്ക്കുവാനായി ഈ തുക ഉപയോഗിച്ച് കൂടുതൽ സബ്ജിക്റ്റുകൾക്കുവേണ്ടി സ്ഥാപിയ്ക്കുന്നതു കഠിനമായിട്ടുള്ളതായിട്ടു കാണുന്നു.

കൂടി നന്നായിരിക്കയില്ലയൊഎന്ന് എനിയ്ക്കുഭിപ്രായമുണ്ട്. ഈ വിഷയത്തിൽ സഭപ്രത്യേകം ആലോചിയ്ക്കേണ്ടതാണ്. ഇതിനാലാഹരണമായി മാരാരിക്കളം, ചേത്തല, അരൂക്കുററി ഈ മൂന്നു സബ്ജിസ്റ്റാർ കച്ചേരികളെ നോക്കാം. ഇവിടങ്ങളിൽ രജിസ്റ്റർ ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ള ആധാരങ്ങളുടെ എണ്ണം ൧൧൦൨-ലെ അഡ്മിനിസ്ട്രേഷൻ റിപ്പോർട്ടിൻപ്രകാരം കാണുന്നത് ൧൧൯൧൪ ആധാരങ്ങളാണ്. ആ താലൂക്കിൽ ഒരു സബ്ജിസ്റ്റാർ കച്ചേരികൂടിസ്ഥാപിച്ച് ഈ ആധാരങ്ങൾ ഏകദേശം തുലാമായി വരത്തക്കവണ്ണം സൗകര്യപ്പെടുത്തുകയാണെങ്കിൽ ക്ലാർക്കുമാർക്കുജോലി കുറയുകയും, ആധാരങ്ങൾ രജിസ്റ്റർ ചെയ്യുന്നതിന് ആ സ്ഥാപനങ്ങൾക്ക് സൗകര്യമുണ്ടാകുകയും ചെയ്യുന്നതാണ്. ഒരു സബ്ജിസ്റ്റാർ കച്ചേരിയ്ക്കു ഏകദേശം റൊണ്ടിൽ മൂവായിരം ആധാരങ്ങൾ ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നാൽ മതിയാകുമെന്നാണ് ഞാൻ പറയുന്നത്. അതിനാൽ നാലു സബ്ജിസ്റ്റാർ കച്ചേരിയിൽ രജിസ്റ്റർ ചെയ്യേണ്ട ആധാരങ്ങളാണ് ഈ മൂന്നു സബ്ജിസ്റ്റാർ കച്ചേരിയിലും കൂടി രജിസ്റ്റർ ചെയ്തുവരുന്നതെന്ന് കാണാവുന്നതാണ്. കൂടുതലായി ഒരു സബ്ജിസ്റ്റാർ കച്ചേരികൂടിസ്ഥാപിക്കുന്നപക്ഷം ഇപ്പോഴുള്ള ജോലിക്കാരുടെ ജോലികുറവിനും ജനങ്ങൾക്കു കറെക്കൂടി സൗകര്യത്തിനും കാരണമാകുന്നതാണ്. അതിനതക്കത്തക്കവണ്ണമുള്ള വിധത്തിൽ കൂടുതൽ സബ്ജിസ്റ്റാർ കച്ചേരികൾസ്ഥാപിയ്ക്കണമെന്നുള്ളതാണ് എനിയ്ക്ക് പറയുവാനുള്ളത്. രജിസ്റ്റർഫീസിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ച ചില എപ്പാടുകൾ ചെയ്യണമെന്നാണ് ഇനിഎനിക്കു പറയാനുള്ളത്. ആധാരങ്ങളുടെ തുക വ്യത്യാസമനുസരിച്ചഫീസ് ചുമത്തിവരുന്നുണ്ട്. ആധാരങ്ങളിലെ തുകയുടെ വ്യത്യാസമനുസരിച്ച് മുദ്രവില ചുമത്തുന്നതു കൂടാതെ ഫീസും വസൂൽചെയ്തുവരുന്നു. ഇതു രണ്ടും കൂടി ആവശ്യമുള്ളതാണോ എന്ന സംഗതിയും പ്രത്യേകം ആലോചിയ്ക്കേണ്ടതാണ്. സബ്ജിസ്റ്റാർമാർ ൫൦,൦൦൦ രൂപയുടെ പത്രത്തിലും ൫,൦൦൦ രൂപയുടെ പത്രത്തിലും നൂറുരൂപയുടെ പത്രത്തിലും എഴുതുന്നവാചകം ഒരുപോലെയാണ്. അതായത് „താഴെ പേരേഴുതി കൈപ്പെറ്റിയിരിക്കുന്ന ആളിനാൽ ഈ ആധാരം ഹാജരാക്കപ്പെട്ടു“ എന്നും മറുമാണ്. ആധാരങ്ങളുടെ പുറത്തേഴുത്തിൽ ഒരു സബ്ജിസ്റ്റാർ ചെയ്യേണ്ട ജോലി ഒരേതരത്തിൽ ആയിരിക്കുന്നതിനാൽ രജിസ്റ്റർ ചെയ്യപ്പെടുന്ന ആധാരങ്ങളുടെ തുക വ്യത്യാസമനുസരിച്ച കൂടുതൽ ഫീസ് ഒട്ടേക്കുണ്ടതാണോ എന്നും ഇതുകൂടി ആലോചിക്കണം. മുദ്രവില ചുമത്തുന്നതു തുക വ്യത്യാസം അനുസരിച്ചു വേണ്ടതാണെന്നു ഞാനും

[Mr. Muruvelil Pachu Pillai.]

സമ്മതിക്കുന്നു. ആ വ്യത്യാസമനുസരിച്ച് രജിസ്റ്റർഫീസ് കൂടുതൽ വാങ്ങിക്കേണ്ട ആവശ്യമില്ല. ഇപ്പോൾ മിസ്റ്റർ താണപിള്ള സൂചിപ്പിച്ചതുപോലെ ഇപ്പോൾ പ്രസിദ്ധപ്പെടുത്തുന്ന അഡ്മിനിസ്ട്രേഷൻ റിപ്പോർട്ടുകൊണ്ട് രജിസ്റ്റർ ചെയ്യപ്പെടുന്ന ആധാരങ്ങളുടെ ഈ വിവരങ്ങളെല്ലാം പൂർണ്ണമായി മനസ്സിലാക്കത്തക്കവണ്ണം ആയിരുന്നാൽ കൊള്ളാമെന്നുള്ള സംഗതികൂടി എനിക്കു ഈ സഭയുടെ ആലോചനയ്ക്കു വിഷയമാക്കേണ്ടിയിരിക്കുന്നു. എന്നു മാത്രമല്ല മുമ്പ് പ്രസിദ്ധപ്പെടുത്തിവന്നിരുന്ന ചില വിവരങ്ങൾ ഇപ്പോൾ വിട്ടുകളയുന്നുമുണ്ട്. കഷ്ടകന്മാർ കർഷകരല്ലാത്തവർക്കു എഴുതിക്കൊടുക്കുന്ന ആധാരങ്ങളുടെ എണ്ണം എത്രയെന്നും അതിലെ തുക എത്രയെന്നും ൧൧൦൧-ലെ അഡ്മിനിസ്ട്രേഷൻ റിപ്പോർട്ടിൽ പറഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ടായിരുന്നു. എന്നാൽ ൧൧൦൨-ൽ പ്രസിദ്ധപ്പെടുത്തിയ അഡ്മിനിസ്ട്രേഷൻ റിപ്പോർട്ടിൽ ആ വിവരങ്ങളൊന്നുമില്ലാ. കർഷകന്മാർ കർഷകരല്ലാത്തവർക്കു എഴുതിക്കൊടുത്ത ആധാരങ്ങളുടെ എണ്ണമോ തുകയോ യാതൊരു വിവരവും അതിൽ ചേർത്തുകാണുന്നില്ല. എന്നാൽ ൧൧൦൧-ൽ അതു ചേർത്തുകാണുന്നുമുണ്ട്. അതിനുശേഷം ഈ പതിവു അനുസരിച്ചു റിപ്പോർട്ടു പ്രസിദ്ധപ്പെടുത്താത്തതിന്റെ കാരണമെന്തെന്നു അറിയുന്നില്ല. അതുകൊണ്ട് ഈ വിവരങ്ങളെല്ലാം ഗവണ്മെൻറിന്റെ ഗാഢമായ ആലോചനയ്ക്കു വിഷയമാക്കണമെന്നുദ്ദേശിച്ചാണ് ഞാൻ ഈ ഉപക്ഷേപം കൊണ്ടുവന്നിട്ടുള്ളതു്.

The House rose for lunch at 1-59 p. m. and re-assembled at 2-45 p. m.

MR. MURIVELIL PACHU PILLAI (*Shertallai*): I beg permission to withdraw the motion.

PRESIDENT: May I take it that the House permits the motion to be withdrawn?

The motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

Motion 128.

The following motion was not moved:—

MR. K. MADHAVAN PILLAI:

To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 3,34,513 under Demand VI by Rs. 100.

Motion 129.

MR. T. C. KESAVA PILLAI (*Kalkulam cum Vilavankod*): Sir, I beg to move the following motion:

To reduce the total demand of Rs. 3,34,513 under Demand VI by Rs. 100.

I make this motion with the idea of placing before the Council the necessity for re-instituting the system which once existed in the Registration Department namely, the preservation of copies of documents in the District Registrar's Offices according to the old system to ensure more safety. In this connection, Sir, I would bring to your notice that it is not detrimental to the interests of any individual much less to the Government by re-instituting the system. Under the existing system only one copy of a document is preserved in the Sub-Registrar's Office. Unfortunately if anything untoward happens to the records by fire or by the prevalent system of searching records by outsiders, the fate of the parties could more or less be imagined, since we cannot get copies of such documents. Of late there are very important partition deeds and other documents. The interested parties may perhaps go to the Registrar's Office remitting Rs. 10 with the idea of getting an encumbrance certificate and may tamper with original documents even without tipping the peons. As I suggested before, to ensure the safety of the public-I emphatically draw the attention of the Government to the necessity of reviving the system which was put a stop to in 1097 by, I think, Mr. Kuruvila Varkey. To add to that, even in District Registrar's Offices, the old records have been destroyed. Most probably Government would say the carrying out of this suggestion would mean an increase in the work of the staff and you would have to allow more funds for the appointment of additional clerks. Originally every Sub-Registrar's Office was provided with *pakarpu kadathu* (പകർപ്പു കടലാസ്) worth about 1½ chackrams. The document and the പകർപ്പു കടലാസ് would be presented before the Sub-Registrar who would endorse the pakarpu as he does the original document and the so called pakarpu would be sent to the District Registrar. If the original in the Sub-Registrar's office were destroyed, the party could get a copy of the document without any difficulty from the District Registrar's Office. I know of one particular instance of late in a particular Registry Office, the name of which I do not like to mention, where a party applied for a certain document. The rival party knowing the details somehow or other entered the Sub-Registrar's Office on the formal plea of getting an encumbrance certificate and made a small hole where it was written Mortgage (മോറിഗ്ജ് കരാർ അനുബന്ധിച്ച വര). The document may amount to a sale deed or anything else. I draw the attention of the Government, therefore, to the necessity of reviving the old system. It would in no way be a loss to the Government as I shall convince them with the following fact.

In 1093, the number of registered documents was 2,41,048; the income was Rs. 5 lakhs and odd; the expenditure was Rs. 2 lakhs and odd; the net surplus was Rs. 2 lakhs and odd. In 1102 the number of documents registered was 3,87,366; the income was nearly 9 lakhs of rupees; the expenditure 3 lakhs and the net surplus 5 lakhs of rupees. If from a department which gets a surplus, on this account, of nearly five lakhs of rupees we spend a portion of the money to safeguard the interests

[Mr. T. C. Kesava Pillai.]

of innocent parties neither the Government nor the people would be grumbling and the money would be well spent. Even if the Government are not willing to provide funds for this purpose the system of levying a fee of 2 chackrams per pakarpu can be introduced. The income on this account comes to about Rs. 24,504. At any rate, even granting that there would be an expenditure in introducing the system. I pray Government that that amount should be expended. Moreover Government were willing to allow an increment in the pay of the staff. The staff would be compelled therefore to do this work also.

As regards the second point in my motion, namely, entrusting the work in connection with Pokkuvaravu cases to the Sub-Registrars, I may say that it is generally done in British India. Immediately after the registration of the sale deed, the pokkuvaravu is also completed by the Sub-Registrars. The work of the Tahsildars is thereby minimised to some extent. These suggestions I place before the Council for its kind consideration.

MR. N. K. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara*): I rise to support the motion of Mr. T. C. Kesava Pillai so far as it relates to the preservation of documents. The preservation of documents, Sir, is as much one of the first concerns of a good Government as ensuring the safety of person. We know as a matter of fact that it is not an unusual occurrence in this country that courts and cutcherries are burnt. The mover himself knows how the Taluk Cutcherry at Vilavankod was reduced to ashes some time back and my friend Mr. G. P. Nilakanta Pillai would be able to say how the Munsiff's court at Karunagapalli was burnt down. What I wish to urge upon the attention of the Government is that they would only be doing their duty to the people by being doubly careful in the matter of the careful preservation of documents, which is meant for the peaceful enjoyment of property. My friend also suggested that by adopting such a procedure the Government will not be doing any new thing but only resuscitating an old salutary practice.

With regard to the other suggestion made by my friend for entrusting the Sub-Registrars with Pokkuvaravu matters, I am sorry to say that I am not at one with my friend's proposal. With these few words, I support my friend's motion particularly in view of the facts and figures quoted by him and the ways and means suggested by him.

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): Sir, in regard to the revival of the rules regulating the destruction of documents I may state that the present rule was arrived at after careful consideration by Government and after public opinion was invited in the matter. In 1918 an Accommodation Committee was convened with Mr. Viraraghavachari, a former Judge of the High Court, as President.

MR. S. PIRAVIPERUMAL PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*): May I know whether the member accepts that the system now proposed is more conducive to the better preservation of the records?

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): I am now stating how the rules came to be modified.

MR. S. PIRAVIPERUMAL PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*): I wish to know what the member thinks of the present arrangement—whether it is better conducive to the preservation of the records.

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): I shall come to that presently.

A Press Communique was issued on 20-8-'21 calling for objections and suggestions from the public and no objections were received. It was only after that and after consultation with the legal advisers of Government that this rule was modified. As a result of the modification of these rules, a substantial portion of the clerical staff was reduced. This, I think, is the first occasion on which any complaint has been made in regard to the rules so modified. If the old rules have to be revived a larger number of hands will have to be employed to attend to that work.

RAO BAHADUR K. A. KRISHNA AIYANGAR, (*Nominated, Deputy President*): Will not there be an increased receipt by the sale of copying sheets for which people have to pay 2 chackrams per sheet?

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): But will the increased receipts be proportionate to the expenditure incurred and the benefits likely to accrue?

RAO BAHADUR K. A. KRISHNA AIYANGAR (*Nominated, Deputy President*): 3 lakhs is about the number of documents registered every year.

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): If the rules are to be revived, an additional staff will have to be employed.

MR. S. PIRAVIPERUMAL PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*): Is it for the purpose of revising the rules that the additional staff has to be employed?

MR. T. K. MADHAVAN NAYAR (*Ag. Secretary to Government*): It is for operating the rules.

In regard to the other point, namely, entrusting the work of Pokkuvaravu to the Sub-Registrars, I may say that it is a question which has to be carefully considered in consultation with the revenue authorities and the member's suggestion will receive consideration.

MR. T. P. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Ag. Chief Secretary to Government*): In regard to the suggestion made by Mr. Kesava Pillai regarding the entrusting of the Pokkuvaravu work to the Sub-Registrars, I will just say a word. At present, as members are aware, the work is done by the Tahsildars. If the work is transferred to the Sub-Registrars as suggested by Mr. T. C. Kesava Pillai, it appears to me that it will not be conducive to efficient or speedy disposal because, before the transfer of registry is effected in accordance with the deed, it has to be verified whether the land is a land over which the vendor had title or whether he sold it away or whether it is Government land or land registered

[Mr. T. P. Ramasubba Aiyar.]

in the name of another. All these will have to be verified by the revenue authorities on the spot and with due reference to the records. The Sub-Registrars have only got the Settlement Register. There are other records for verification before a recommendation could be sent by the Proverthikar that the transfer of registry is in order. The Tahsildar oftentimes will have to go to the spot. If this work is to be entrusted to the Sub-Registrar, who is to do all this verification? What agency has the Sub-Registrar for carrying out this verification and what records has he for the purpose? If he is to do this work, he will have to refer the whole matter to the Proverthikar through the Tahsildar. Is it going to help towards the speedy disposal of the case? Without reference to the records, will the disposal be efficient? Therefore I say that even in the interests of the people, it is better that the work remains in the hands of the Tahsildar.

Another suggestion made was that instead of the Sub-Registrar, the District Registrar may do this work. The case is still worse because the District Registrar is more distant from the Proverthikar than the Sub-Registrar. I am aware that in British India, some of the Sub-Magistrates and Sub-Registrars are allowed to do this work. But I have really my doubts whether this work is done properly there. In Travancore formerly there was some delay in the disposal of these cases but the Pokkuvaravu rules now insist upon the speedy disposal of these cases and the Tahsildars are now current in the matter. The public have also no complaint. If their files are examined it will be found that they have only a few current cases pending.

MR. S. PIRAVIPERUMAL PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*): May I know whether the member has any objection to the system proposed for the preservation of these documents?

MR. T. P. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Ag. Chief Secretary to Government*): I am not quite familiar with that work. My friend, the Official member in charge of this Department, has already explained the situation. This matter was carefully considered and it was decided that it was unnecessary to modify the present system since we have got all these documents in one bound volume. If we are going to revive it, a large staff of additional clerks will have to be employed. There will also be levy of fees on the extra copy. After all, the advantages will not be commensurate with the labour and money that the change may entail. The question was very carefully examined and it is now a number of years since the new system has been working. If we are to revive the old system there will be some disturbance in the Sub-Registry Offices.

MR. S. PIRAVIPERUMAL PILLAI (*Commerce and Industry, South*): Apart from the disturbance, does the member think that it will be better conducive to revive the old system?

MR. T. P. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Ag. Chief Secretary to Government*): As an abstract proposition nobody can deny that, but for practical purposes the present arrangement appears to me to be quite sufficient.

It was examined in all its aspects and public opinion was invited on the matter. Only after that were the rules modified. The present suggestion is to go back to the old rules. If we are going to change rules thus, it may lead to physical inconveniences in the office.

MR. T. C. KESAVA PILLAI (*Kalkulam cum Vilavankod*): The member was suggesting that it is better to adhere to the new rules but at times we will have to change the rules if they do not work properly as in the case of the conversion of the Assistant Tahsildars into Revenue Supervisors.

MR. T. P. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Ag. Chief Secretary to Government*): There is no difference as regards that matter between the member and myself.

MR. T. C. KESAVA PILLAI (*Kalkulam cum Vilavankod*): May I know whether there is any objection in re-examining the question.

MR. T. P. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Ag. Chief Secretary to Government*): Certainly the member's suggestions will be referred to the Director of Registration and the whole question will be re-examined.

As regards the second suggestion I believe the interests of the people will be better served in leaving the work relating to the Pokkuvavaru cases in the hands of the Tahsildars and Taluk Head Accountants.

MR. T. C. KESAVA PILLAI (*Kalkulam cum Vilavankod*): I withdraw the second portion of my motion. As regards the first portion I press the matter to a division.

PRESIDENT: I do not think there are any parts to the motion. The motion is to reduce Rs. 100. Which part of the Rs. 100 do you wish to be reduced?

MR. T. P. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Ag. Chief Secretary to Government*): The object should not form part of the motion at all.

MR. T. C. KESAVA PILLAI (*Kalkulam cum Vilavankod*): I press the whole matter to a division.

The motion was put to the vote and carried, 23 voting for and 16 against.

PRESIDENT: I put the total Demand VI-Registration-Rs. 3,34,513 less Rs.100 to the vote. I suppose the House grants the demand.

The motion was carried and the grant was made.

DEMAND VII.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—

HEADS OTHER THAN ACCOUNT OFFICE.

MR. T. P. RAMASUBBA AIYAR (*Ag. Chief Secretary to Government*): I make a demand for Rs. 2,04,859 under Demand VII-General Administration—Heads other than the Account Office.